

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

APR 26 2007

REMARKSI. Introduction

In response to the Office Action dated January 9, 2007, claims 1, 10, 11, 12, 21, 22, 23, 32 and 33 have been amended. Claims 1-33 remain in the application. Re-examination and re-consideration of the application, as amended, is requested.

II. Specification Objections

In paragraph (4) of the Office Action, the specification was objected to because of certain informalities.

Applicants' attorney has made amendments to the specification as indicated above to overcome these objections.

III. Statutory Subject Matter Rejection

In paragraphs (5)-(6) of the Office Action, claims 16-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Applicants' attorney has amended the claims as indicated above to overcome these rejections.

However, should issues still remain in this regard, Applicants' attorney requests that the Examiner indicate how the rejection can be overcome, in accordance with the directives of the Interim Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications for Patent Subject Matter Eligibility (Interim Guidelines) II. Specifically, should it be necessary, the Applicants' attorney requests that the Examiner identify features of the invention that would render the claimed subject matter statutory if recited in the claim. See Interim Guidelines IV.B.

IV. Non-Art Rejections

In paragraphs (7)-(8) of the Office Action, claims 1-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Applicants' attorney has amended the claims as indicated above to overcome these rejections.

#### V. Double Patenting Rejection

In paragraphs (9)-(10) of the Office Action, claims 1-33 were rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-15 of copending Application No. 10/800786. In paragraph (11) of the Office Action, claims 1-33 were rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-21 of copending Application No. 10/800877.

Applicants' attorney submits herewith a Terminal Disclaimer to overcome these rejections.

#### VI. Prior Art Rejections

In paragraphs (12)-(13) of the Office Action, claims 1, 3, 12, 14, 23, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bonney et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,466,953 (Bonney) in view of Takahashi et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,339,439 (Takahashi). In paragraph (14) of the Office Action, claims 2, 13, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bonney, in view of Takahashi as cited and applied to claim 1, and further in view of Love et al., U.S. Publication No. 2004/0177089 (Love). In paragraph (15) of the Office Action, claims 4, 15, and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bonney in view of Takahashi as cited and applied to claim 1, and further in view of Matthews et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,047,180 (Matthews). In paragraph (16) of the Office Action, claims 5-11, 16-22, and 27-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bonney in view of Takahashi as cited and applied to claim 1, and further in view of Kawai, U.S. Publication No. 2003/0043177 (Kawai).

Applicants' attorney respectfully traverse these rejections in view of the above amendments.

Independent claims 1, 12, and 23 have been amended to overcome the rejections based on the cited references. Specifically, the independent claims now recite the function of Automatic View Creation, such that the Sheet Set Manager presents a user with a list of the views defined in a Sheet Set and the user places a view from the list onto a Sheet to invoke the Automatic View Creation. None of the references, taken individually or in any combination teach or suggest these limitations.

For example, with regard to dependent claims 5, 16 and 27, which recite that "the Sheet Set Manager automatically creates one or more different views for the Sheets in response to a user command," the Office Action acknowledges that these limitations are not shown in Bonney, but asserts that they are shown in Kawai. However, the Office Action notes that Kawai merely describes creating an exploded view of a design in response to a user selecting an "All" or "First Level" button shown in Figure 7. However, nowhere does Kawai present a user with a list of the

views, where the user places a view from the list onto a sheet to invoke the exploded view. Consequently, Kawai does not teach or suggest these limitations.

Moreover, the various elements of Applicants' claimed invention together provide operational advantages over Bonney, Takahashi, Love, Mathews and Kawai. In addition, Applicants' invention solves problems not recognized by Bonney, Takahashi, Love, Mathews and Kawai.

Thus, Applicants' attorney submits that independent claims 1, 12, and 23 are allowable over Bonney, Takahashi, Love, Mathews and Kawai. Further, dependent claims 2-11, 13-22, and 24-33 are submitted to be allowable over Bonney, Takahashi, Love, Mathews and Kawai in the same manner, because they are dependent on independent claims 1, 12, and 23, respectively, and thus contain all the limitations of the independent claims. In addition, dependent claims 2-11, 13-22, and 24-33 recite additional novel elements not shown by Bonney, Takahashi, Love, Mathews and Kawai.

#### VII. Conclusion

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is now in good order for allowance and such allowance is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner believe minor matters still remain that can be resolved in a telephone interview, the Examiner is urged to call Applicants' undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,


GATES & COOPER LLP  
Attorneys for Applicants

Howard Hughes Center  
6701 Center Drive West, Suite 1050  
Los Angeles, California 90045  
(310) 641-8797

Date: April 26, 2007

GHG/

G&C 30566.319-US-01

By:   
Name: George H. Gates  
Reg. No.: 33,500